



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

than the longer one. This shows that, in these two telescopes, the photographic brightness of the stars is proportional to

$$\sqrt[4]{f} \text{ or to } \sqrt[3]{f}.$$

The disc of a given star was larger in the longer telescope about in the proportion of 50:45.

This proportional size agrees with the result of observation when we assume that like quantities of light are spread over discs of different size—namely, that the shorter telescope gives stars  $\frac{5}{6}$  of a magnitude fainter than the other. Professor DUNÉR therefore concludes that the different brightness in the two instruments depends only on the fact that the maker did not succeed in getting the star-images so small in the telescope of longer focal length and has nothing to do with the relative foci, as such.

E. S. H.

#### ELEVATIONS AT MOUNT HAMILTON.

We are often asked for the exact elevations of points on Mount Hamilton. The following data are derived from a survey made by students of the University of California in 1887, under the direction of W. G. RAYMOND, then their Instructor in Engineering.

	Feet above Sea.
Top of the wooden cover of the reservoir <i>Copernicus</i> . . . . .	4383.89
Top of the wooden cover of the reservoir <i>Kepler</i> . . . . .	4256.28
Highest point of the peak <i>Tycho Brahe</i> . . . . .	4214.76
Marble floor of the Lick Observatory . . . . .	4209.46
Top of masonry of the reservoir <i>Huyghens</i> . . . . .	4178.43
Top of masonry of the reservoir <i>Aquarius</i> . . . . .	3843.99
Oak tree at <i>Joaquin Springs</i> (B. M.) . . . . .	3578.65
Smith Creek (B. M.) . . . . .	2146.2
Hall's Valley (B. M.) . . . . .	1543.5
Summit between Hall's Valley and Grand View (B. M.) . . . .	1838.0
Grand View House (B. M.) . . . . .	1500.5
Junction House (B. M.) . . . . .	389.0
San José; S. P. R. R. track at station (assumed) . . . . .	88.7

E. S. H.

#### METEOR FALL IN ARIZONA.

“TUCSON, Sept. 8, 1891.—A meteor of unusual brilliancy and size passed over Tucson at 12:25 last night. It was first seen in the southeast with a long tail of bluish-green fire. Afterward, when seen north of the city, it seemed reduced in size. The light was as brilliant as calcium when seen close to the ground,